required for Claims 1-5 and 11 (of Group I) would necessarily encompass examination and searching of the subject matter of Claims 6-10 and 12 (of Group II). For this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that the examination of Groups I and II do not constitute an undue burden.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Restriction between Groups I and II is improper, and that the claims of Groups I and II should be examined together.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims possess unity of invention, as being linked by a special technical feature not disclosed in the prior art. Specifically, Applicants point out that Toorongian and Hyodo *et al.*, cited to support a lack of unity of invention, do not disclose a process for producing a radioactive-fluorine-labeled compound or a production apparatus, as claimed. For this reason also, Applicants maintain that all of Claims 1-12 should be examined on the merits in the instant application.

Also, Applicants submit that the Examiner has not shown that is would be a burden to examine all of the species.

Applicant submits that if any of the elected claims are found to be allowable, claims dependent therefrom should similarly be considered allowable in the same application.

Further, Applicant reserves the right to file a Divisional Application directed to nonelected claims 6-10 and 12. RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION AND ELECTION OF SPECIES REQUIREMENTS

U.S. Application No. 10/574,588 (Q94096)

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is directed and authorized to charge all required

fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please

also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060 Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

Date: September 17, 2009

Registration No. 58,902